

Appl. No. 10/609,079
Amdt. Dated 1/12/2006
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2005

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action (Requirement for Restriction) mailed December 15, 2005. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is improper and traverses the requirement for restriction. MPEP §803 indicates that there are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed (see MPEP §806.05 *et seq.*) and (ii) there must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §806.02, MPEP §806.04 *et seq.*; MPEP §808.01 *et seq.*). Herein, the Examiner has not established either criterion.

First, the restriction is based on Figure illustrations and not the claimed inventions. Second, by a failure to review the claims, there appears to be no serious burden on the examiner for the examination. Hence, withdrawal of the requirement for restriction is requested.

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 and 25 are considered to be generic. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 15, 19 and 24 further constitute generic claims since these claims are directed to multiple alleged species identified in the Office Action. Reconsideration of the generic nature of these claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner needs further examination, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

In accordance with the requirement to provide an election, even with traverse, Applicants hereby elect Group III. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-34 may apply to Group III based on the presence of generic independent claims. As requested in the Office Action, it appears that the "AC disconnecting and regulating connector module" of FIG. 3 is set forth in dependent claims 4-10, 12, 29 and 30. Moreover, it appears that the "AC disconnecting connector module of FIG. 4 is shown in claim 17, the "connector module with shift registers" of FIG. 7 appears to be set forth in dependent claim 14 and the "opto-coupling detector module" of FIG. 9 appears to be set forth in dependent claim 13.

Appl. No. 10/609,079
Amdt. Dated 1/12/2006
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2005

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request examination of the subject matter at the earliest possible opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: January 12, 2006

By


William W. Scheal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 1/12/2006

FACSIMILE

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.


Susan McFurlane

1/12/2006

Date